



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,982	09/19/2003	Tzvi Avnery	2251.2002-009	8622
21005 7590 11/25/2008 HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C. 530 VIRGINIA ROAD P.O. BOX 9133 CONCORD, MA 01742-9133				
EXAMINER				
MAYEKAR, KISHOR				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1795				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/25/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/666,982

Applicant(s)

AVNERY, TZVI

Examiner

Kishor Mayekar

Art Unit

1795

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 24 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 24 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 24 and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by EP 1376021. EP '021's invention is directed to an air supplying system for supplying clean air. EP '021 discloses in Fig. 2 that the air supplying system comprises an air supply duct 4 having a rectangular cross section, and a sterilization section 10 having an electron beam emitter 11. In Fig. 6, EP '021 discloses the recited first and second electron beam emitter.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over EP '021. EP '021 as applied above further discloses that the system can be used for in the facilities like hospitals, factories that produce medical products, food products, semiconductors or biotechnology related products (paragraph 2). As such, the recited substrate would include volatile organic compounds. If

not since the recited substance is not a structure of the claimed system, it cannot be given any patentable weight.

5. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reuter et al. (US 4,595,569) in view of Helfritsch et al. (US 5,695,616), both references cited in a previous Office action. Reuter's invention is directed to a device for desulphurizing and denitrating flue gases by electron beam irradiation to which ammonia has been added prior to the irradiation. Reuter discloses in Figs. 1 and 2 that the device comprises the recited duct and first and second electron beam emitters. Reuter further discloses in col. 3, lines 15-27 the uniform and continuous electron beam coverage, and in the abstract the addition of ammonia prior to the electron beam irradiation. The difference between Reuter and the above claims is the provision that the duct has a port for introducing a reaction reagent into the duct to the gases. Helfritsch teaches in a device for treating flue gases by irradiation with electron beam the limitation (Fig. 1). The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Reuter's teachings as shown by Helfritsch because this would result in adding the ammonia to the flue gas.

As to the subject matter of claim 5, since it is not a structure, it cannot be given any patentable weight.

6. Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reuter '569 as modified by Helfritsch '616 as applied to claims 1-5 above, and further in view of Namba et al. (US 5,244,552) and Hirai (US 5,015,442), both references cited in the last Office action. The difference between the references as applied above and the instant claims is the provision of the recited reactive bed. Namba teaches in an apparatus for gas treatment by electron beam irradiation that that ozone is formed during the treatment (col. 3, lines 49-52). Hirai teaches in a device for treating air the provision of particulate catalyst to remove ozone therefrom (Fig. 1). The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the references' teachings as shown by Namba and Hirai because this would result in removing ozone generated during the treatment. Further, it has been held that the motivation to make a specific structure is always related to the properties or uses one skilled in the art would expect the structure to have, *In re Newell* 13 USPQ 2d 1248, *Fromson v. Advance Offset Plate* 225 USPQ 26; *In re Gyurik* 201 USPQ 552.

7. Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP '021 as applied to claims 4-5 above, and further in view of Namba '552 and Hirai '442. The difference between the references as applied above and the instant claims is the provision of the recited reactive bed. Namba teaches in an apparatus for gas treatment by electron

beam irradiation that that ozone is formed during the treatment (col. 3, lines 49-52). Hirai teaches in a device for treating air the provision of particulate catalyst to remove ozone therefrom (Fig. 1). The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified EP '021's teachings as shown by Namba and Hirai because this would result in removing ozone generated during the treatment. Further, it has been held that the motivation to make a specific structure is always related to the properties or uses one skilled in the art would expect the structure to have, *In re Newell* 13 USPQ 2d 1248, *Fromson v. Advance Offset Plate* 225 USPQ 26; *In re Gyurik* 201 USPQ 552.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 7 August 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the new ground of rejections as set forth in the paragraphs above.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kishor Mayekar whose telephone number is (571) 272-1339. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on

Art Unit: 1795

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kishor Mayekar/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1795